

REMARKS

Applicants, by the amendments presented above and the arguments presented below, have made a concerted effort to present claims which clearly define over the prior art of record, and thus to place this case in condition for allowance. Claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-24 and 26-43 are currently pending. Claims 29-43 are newly added. Claims 9, 21 and 25 have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-13, 19-22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 2,303,148 to Tinnerman.

Applicant has cancelled claims 9, 21 and 25 and, therefore, considers the rejection of these claims to be moot.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 10 and, in view of the amendments, respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claims 1 and 10 as being anticipated by Tinnerman. Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 10 to require that a first portion of the nut member be configured to engage (the body of) the cage member such that a second portion of the nut member does not come into contact with either the base portion of (the body of) the cage member or the at least one wall portion of the cage member. Because of this configuration, (the body of) the cage member provides a limited range of movement of the nut member in at least one dimension and further allows access to the aperture of the nut member within the limited range of movement of the nut member.

Tinnerman does not disclose or suggest such a structure as claimed in amended independent claims 1 and 10. Conversely, the cage member (as explained by the Examiner is the item having arms 13, base 10, and aperture 11) does not provide any range of movement

of the nut member in any direction. According to Tinnerman, the nut member is held in the cage member such that the nut member cannot be turned or rotated, and further is held in a fixed or locked relation within the cage member such that even accidental displacement or unintentional removal of the nut member is not possible. Support for this statement can be found in Tinnerman at least in the following areas: page 2, col. 1, lines 24-32; page 2, col. 1, lines 59-65; page 2, col. 2, lines 34-37; page 2, col. 2, lines 48-70; page 3, col. 1, lines 13-24; and page 3, col. 1, lines 30-36. Thus, Tinnerman clearly does not disclose or suggest a cage member which is configured to provide a limited range of movement of the nut member encaged therein in at least one dimension; Tinnerman allows for absolutely no movement of the nut member encaged within the cage member.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 1 and 10 as amended.

As Applicant states that independent claim 1 as amended is now in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-8 which are dependent on independent claim 1. Applicant notes that amendments have been made to claims 2, 5 and 8 in view of the amendments made to independent claim 1.

As Applicant states that independent claim 10 as amended is now in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 11-20 and 27. Applicant notes that amendments have been made to claims 11, 14, 16, 17 and 20 in view of the amendments made to independent claim 10.

Applicant has amended independent claim 22 and, in view of the amendments, respectfully traverses the rejection of independent claim 22 as being anticipated by Tinnerman. Applicant has amended independent claim 22 to require that a the cage member define a base portion and an upper portion where the upper portion of the cage member is

configured to engage the nut member and further configured to be flexed downwardly by the nut member toward the base portion in order to allow the nut member to contact the base portion.

Tinnerman does not disclose or suggest such a structure as claimed in amended independent claim 22. Conversely, Tinnerman has a base portion (identified as reference numeral #10 by the Examiner) and arms 13 which extend downwardly therefrom, as illustrated in the drawings. Thus, first of all, Tinnerman does not have a cage member having a base portion and, separately therefrom, an upper portion; in Tinnerman, the base portion would have to be the upper portion and, thus, the arms 13 of Tinnerman cannot be said to be the upper portion of the cage member. Second, the base portion of Tinnerman – in other words the upper portion of Tinnerman – does not engage any portion of the nut member as is clearly illustrated in the drawings. Even if the arms 13 of Tinnerman were argued to be the upper portion of the cage member of Tinnerman, the arms 13 of Tinnerman definitely are not flexed downwardly by the nut member toward the base portion in order to allow the nut member to contact the base portion. The nut member in Tinnerman never comes into contact with the base 10. Further, the arms 13 are only flexed outwardly by the nut member in order to hold it in tight fixed relation thereto; the arms 13 are not flexed downwardly toward the base portion. Thus, Tinnerman clearly does not disclose or suggest a combination as defined in amended independent claim 22.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 22 as amended.

As Applicant states that independent claim 22 as amended is now in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 23, 24, 26 and 28 which are dependent on independent claim 22. Applicant notes that amendments have

been made to claim 26 in view of the amendments made to independent claim 22.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 2,303,148 to Tinnerman.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As Applicant states that independent claim 22 as amended is now in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 23 which is dependent on independent claim 22.

Newly Added Claims

Applicant has added new claims 29-43. Claims 29, 34 and 39-43 are independent claims. Claims 30-33 are dependent on independent claim 29. Claims 35-38 are dependent on independent claim 34.

Applicant states that claims 29-43 are allowable in view of the prior art of record at the time of issuance of the second non-final Office Action, as well as in view of the prior art disclosed in the two Supplemental Information Disclosure Statements submitted today. Thus, consideration and allowance of claims 29-43 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 14-18, 24 and 26-28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As Applicant states that independent claims 10 and 22 as amended are now in condition for allowance, and because claims 14-18, 24 and 26-28 are dependent on independent claims 10 and 22 and therefore also in condition for allowance, Applicant has not amended claims 14-18, 24 and 26-28 into independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant, though, reserves the right to possibly present such claims in a future Amendment.

In view of the above Amendments and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the application are allowable over the rejections of the Examiner. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, the Examiner is invited to contact one of the undersigned attorneys at (312) 704-1890.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 20, 2005

By: James A. O'Malley
Richard A. Giangiori, Reg. No. 24,284
James A. O'Malley, Reg. No. 45,952
TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORI,
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.
105 W. Adams Street, 36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 704-1890

752914